DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 565 CS 213 521

AUTHOR Endres, Kathleen L.; Schierhorn, Ann B.
TITLE Closing the Gap: An Analysis of Gender-Based Differences and Similarities in Magazine-Writing Instruction.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (75th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, August 5-8, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Higher Education; *Periodicals; *Sex Differences; Surveys; *Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Styles; Writing for Publication; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Magazine Writing; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study examined whether expected behavior from teachers coincides with how women and men really teach their magazine-writing classes. Subjects, 120 of 198 members of the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, responded to a 25-item questionnaire concerning their teaching techniques. Results indicated that (contrary to anecdotes, student expectations, and stereotypes) women and men--with a few notable exceptions--teach in similar manners. Results further indicated that women preferred a participatory classroom style that used the workshop method, involved the instructor in each step of the student's writing process, and urged students to assume the coaching job. (Six tables of data and 32 footnotes are included.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Closing the Gap:
An Analysis of Gender-Based Differences and Similarities in Magazine-Writing Instruction

ED349565

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Schierhorn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

By

Kathleen L. Endres, associate professor,
School of Communication, University of Akron
and Ann B. Schierhorn, assistant professor,
School of Journalism and Mass Communication,
Kent State University

A paper prepared for presentation to the Magazine Division
of the Association for Education in Journalism
and Mass Communication, national convention,
Montreal, August 5 to 8, 1992

CS213521

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Closing the Gap:
An Analysis of Gender-Based Differences and Similarities in Magazine Writing Instruction

Anecdotal evidence, student expectations and stereotypes would lead us to believe that women and men teach in different manners. Women instructors are expected to be more supportive, motherly, nurturing, while men may follow structured, traditional approaches that are viewed as indicative of strong, intellectual and dynamic teachers.[1]

But does expected behavior really coincide with the realities in the classroom?

This study, based on a survey of magazine educators, looks into how women and men teach their writing classes in the hopes of answering that question. It examines how closely anecdotal evidence, student expectations and stereotypes of women--and men--teachers match the reality of the classroom.

Literature Review

Research examining the roles and functions of women in academe has tended to follow three main paths: 1. studies that examine woman's place within the faculties; 2. examinations and essays dealing with course material content; and 3. analysis of how the genders learn.

The most numerous of these studies are in the first area. This research touches on a wide variety of topics--from the number of

---

[1]Bernice Resnick Sandler, "Women Faculty at Work in the Classroom, or, Why It Still Hurts to be a Woman in Labor," Communication Education, Vol. 40: No. 1, pp. 6-15.

women employed to their educational backgrounds, from professional/teaching experience to tenure and promotion decisions, from job satisfaction to teaching evaluations. But all deal with areas that seek to examine woman's place within the faculties themselves.

One of the most comprehensive of these studies was done by Sharp, Turk, Einsiedel, Schamber and Hollenback in 1983.[2] Funded by the Gannett Foundation, this study followed up on Rush, Oukrop and Ernst's 1972 study of women in journalism education.[3] The 1983 study found more women teaching than the 1972 study did, but they remained relegated to the lowest academic ranks--instructors or positions other than professor, associate professor and assistant professor. The Sharp study also found women paid less. Moreover, there was a substantial gap between the genders in teaching/professional experience and academic credentials, with women lagging behind in each of these areas.[4]

In 1988 Schamber updated that research, finding that the number of women in communication education had grown to 24 percent of the faculties. Yet, they were still most likely to be found in the lowest academic ranks: assistant professor, instructor or "other." The 1988 study did show, however, that the gap between the genders in academic credentials was closing.[5]

---

[2]Nancy W. Sharp, Judy VanSlyke Turk, Edna F. Einsiedel, Linda Schamber, Sharon Hollenback, Faculty Women in Journalism and Mass Communications: Problems and Progress, Syracuse, NY.

[3]Ramona Rush, Carol E. Oukrop, and Sandra Ernst, "More than Your Ever Wanted to Know about Women and Journalism Education," a paper presented before the Division of Minorities and Communication, Association for Education in Journalism, Carbondale, Ill, August 1972.

[4]Sharp et. al., op. cit., pp. 3-4.

[5]Linda Schamber, "Women in Mass Communication Education: Who is Teaching Tomorrow's Communicators," in Pamela J. Creedon (ed), Women in Mass

Other studies have taken a narrower view. For example, Larissa Grunig focused on sex discrimination in promotion and tenure in a department of Journalism and James D. Kelly looked at links between gender, pay and job satisfaction in journalism faculties.[6] More studies have touched on the presence of sexism in student evaluations, still the standard measure of teaching effectiveness. These studies have shown that students often expect female instructors to follow stereotypical behaviors. Women instructors, who do not, suffer on student evaluations as a result.[7]

Less numerous, but nonetheless important, are examinations and essays dealing with course material that point to the need for including women in all subject areas. For example, Spitzack and Carter cite the need to include speeches by women in the anthologies of speech communications.[8] For more than a decade, researchers have called for a similar inclusion of women in journalism history. Marzolf's Up From the Footnote and Beasley and Silver's Women in

---

Communication: Challenging Gender Values, Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications Inc., 1989, pp. 148-

[6]Larissa Grunig, "Sex Discrimination in Promotion and Tenure in Journalism Education," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 66: No. 1 (Spring 1989), pp. 93-100; James D. Kelly, "Gender Pay and Job Satisfaction of Faculty in Journalism," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 66: No. 2 (Summer 1989).

[7]S.A. Basow and K.G. Howe, "Evaluations of College Professors: Effects of Professors, Sex-Type and Student Sex," Psychology Reports, Vol. 60, pp. 671-8. Maryellen Gleason, "Getting a Perspective on Student Evaluation," AAHE Bulletin, Feb. 1986, pp. 10-13. Ellyn Kaschak, "Sex Bias in Student Evaluations of College Professors," Psychology of Women Quarterly, Vol. 3: No. 3 (1978), pp. 235-43.

[8]Carole Spitzack and Kathryn Carter deal with a variety of topics in their article, "Women in Communication Studies: A Typology for Revision," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol 73: No. 4 (November 1987), pp. 401-423.

Media: A Documentary Source Book are some of the first attempts to remedy past oversights in journalism history.[9]

The issue of inclusiveness is a continuing one in journalism and mass communication education. The Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication's accrediting teams measure a school's progress toward the goal of inclusiveness before making final recommendations.[10]

In another area of gender-based scholarship, research in other disciplines has examined how gender is a factor in the learning process. Masket and Hertz-Lazarowitz based their studies on literature and language arts classes in Israel. In their observations, the researchers found that the gender composition of the group seems to affect the learning process. Gray et. al. examined the introductory speech communications classes at Central Michigan and found that Personalized System of Instruction Model and the self-contained model for teaching were affected by the gender and experience differences of the students.[11]

---

[9]Marion Marzolf, Up From the Footnote: A History of Women Journalists (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1977) and Maurine Beasley and Sheila Silver, Women in Media: A Documentary Source Book (Washington, D.C.: Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press, 1977).

[10]Standard 12, "Minority and Female Representation," Accredited Journalism and Mass Communications Education, 1991-92, Accrediting Council, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1991.

[11]Ditza Maskit and Rachel Hertz-Lazarowitz, "Adults in Cooperative Learning: Effects of Group Size and Group Gender Composition on Group Learning Behaviors," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 16-20, 1986; Pamela L. Gray and others, "Recognizing the Impact of Gender and Other Demographic/Cognitive Differences on Learning and Attitude Formation in the Basic Course," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, Nov. 5-8, 1987.

Even in the journalism/mass communication field, certain researchers have asked what new approaches might be needed to instruct the increasing number of women students. Guidelines provided by Egan[12] offer valuable steps in developing approaches to better educate women for careers in broadcasting.

Those studies have shed light upon women faculty in journalism/mass communication. As a result, the whole educational process has been cast into the spotlight. But one area remains shrouded in shadows: how women--and men--teach.

This topic has surfaced in a number of studies, but most observations have been anecdotal. Sharp et. al. reported responses from female faculty members: "Women continue to accept the burden of the nurturing role...." "I think they [students] automatically think that the women are going to be more sympathetic and more understanding with them and should spend more time with them than male faculty members."[13] That sentiment has been echoed in other studies. Women instructors in any number of disciplines are expected by students to fulfill a nurturing, maternal role.[14]

Studies on feminist pedagogy have emphasized that the role of women as outsiders and nurturers might actually benefit the students. Maher's analysis of feminist pedagogy includes both "liberation" and "gender" models. In her analysis, the "liberation"

---

[12]Kathryn S. Egan, "New Approaches for Teaching Female Students in Broadcasting," Journalism Educator, Vol. 46: No. 3 (Autumn 1991), pp. 36-41.

[13]Sharp et. al., op. cit., p. 51.

[14]Basow and Silberg, op. cit., pp. 308-14, Shiela Bennett, "Student Perceptions of and Expectations for Male and Female Instructors; Evidence Relating to the Question of Gender Bias in Teaching Evaluation," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 74: No. 2, (1982), pp. 170-9.

model encourages students to critique the dominant world view and discover their own voices. The "gender" model builds on women's roles as mothers rather than as members of an oppressed group. This model of teaching is seen as more participatory than traditional educational models.[15]

Maher's "gender" model parallels Shrewsbury's vision of a classroom as a "liberatory environment." In Shrewsbury's vision, women practice a participatory teaching style in which students develop independence and work together to reach shared and individual goals in an atmosphere of positive feedback.[16]

The "participatory" style has been advocated by some journalism writing instructors as well, although not necessarily from a feminist pedagogical perspective. For example, a recent Journalism Educator article offers an account of participatory classroom teaching, whose foundation is drawn from the process method of writing instruction.

Building on composition as opposed to feminist pedagogy, Hresan observed that the process writing method used in her news writing course at Shepherd College created an environment that allowed students to take more responsibility for their own learning and enhanced their self esteem. This climate allowed students to discover writing methods on their own. "In this respect, the process

---

[15]Frances A. Maher, "Toward a Richer Theory of Feminist Pedagogy: A Comparison of 'Liberation' and 'Gender' Models for Teaching and Learning," Journal of Education, Vol. 169: No. 3 (1987), pp. 91-100.

[16]Carolyn M. Shrewsbury, "What is Feminist Pedagogy?" Women Studies Quarterly, Vol. XV: Nos. 3/4 (Fall/Winter 1987), pp. 6-13.

writing method seems to be about freedom--freedom to learn for yourself and from others."[17]

Clearly, there are parallels between the gender model of feminist pedagogy, with its goal of a liberatory environment in the classroom for the student, and the process writing pedagogy, with its goal of "freeing" students to write.

These anecdotal observations, pedagogical essays, personal experiences, generalizations and student expectations seem to suggest that women and men teach in different manners; and this perspective has reached almost a level of doctrine, without much empirical evidence to substantiate it.

Few studies have even considered gender as a factor in examining teaching methods or styles. One of the few that has deals with Physical Education instructors. Vertinsky found that the male instructors exerted discipline and focused on specified goals. In contrast, women avoided the use of forceful discipline and endorsed more diffused goals.[18]

Physical Education instruction, of course, is far removed from journalism and mass communication. Nonetheless, this empirical study offers at least some support for the anecdotal evidence that suggests that women and men teach in different manners. But, as noted, physical education bears little similarity to journalism and mass communication. The gender differences noted in Physical

---

[17]Sally L Hresan, "Process Method of Teaching the News Writing Class," Journalism Educator, Vol. 46: No. 4 (Winter 1992), p. 62.

[18]Patricia Vertinsky, "In Search of a Gender Dimension: An Empirical Investigation of Teacher Preferences for Teaching Strategies in Physical Education," Journal of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 16: No. 4 (Oct-Dec. 1984), pp. 425-30.

Education may not spill over to the journalism and mass communication field.

This paper will build on this and previous research to examine how women and men say they teach.

Method

A 25-item questionnaire was developed to gauge the teaching techniques used in one specific field of print journalism--magazines. This area was selected for several reasons: first, it represented a slice of the journalism field appropriate and manageable for analysis; second, little research has been done in teaching in this field of journalism; third, this area seemed to be flexible enough to accommodate a range of teaching techniques and styles;[19] and fourth, the researchers have a special interest in this field. Two classes became the focus of this study: feature writing and magazine article writing, the core writing courses in the magazine field.[20]

Members of the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication received this mail questionnaire. These members were selected because they represented a readily identifiable group of instructors who were likely to teach magazine and/or feature writing classes. In March and April 1991, 198 individuals were surveyed. After the first and follow up mailing, 120 questionnaires (60.6 percent) were returned. Two of these were repeats and 13 were uncodeable. Thus, 105 (53 percent of all surveyed) were the basis of the findings that follow.

---

[19]Ann Schierhorn, "The Role of the Writing Coach in the Magazine Curriculum," Journalism Educator, Vol. 46: No. 2 (Summer 1991), pp. 46-53.

[20]Remarks, Caroline Dow, former Magazine Division head, at the division's business meeting, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual convention, Boston, August 1991.

The classrooms of the respondents were not visited. Findings are based solely on the instructors' responses and statements in the completed questionnaire.

This study was not designed initially to focus solely on similarities and differences in the teaching styles between the genders. This study was initially conceptualized to analyze the extent to which process instructional methods[21] had permeated the journalism writing classroom. However, this study also yielded data that cast light upon how women and men teach the writing classes within the magazine field.

---

[21] In this study, process-oriented instruction deals with the story as a process, emphasizing each part of the writing process (i.e. idea, reporting, organization, writing and rewriting). This technique may be characterized by a teacher grading or providing feedback throughout the writing process. In contrast, the product-oriented method emphasizes the final product. The instructor provides extensive comments and a grade once the story is complete.

Results

The women respondents were younger than the men by a statistically significant margin.[22] Average age of the women was 41.9 years, compared to the men at 48.7 years.

Educational differences between the groups were not statistically significant,[23] yet merit some discussion. Women were better educated than the male respondents: 49 percent of the women held PhDs while only about 39 percent of the men did so. Another 45 percent of the women held master's degrees, compared to 40.4 percent of the men. The remaining 6 percent of the women and 21.2 percent of the men held other degrees.

The two groups also differed in the amount of professional journalistic experience, this time by margins that were statistically significant.[24] Women had less professional journalistic experience than men: 10.4 years compared to 14.3 years.

In teaching experience, however, the two groups had virtually identical amounts of teaching experience. Women had 10.3 years experience compared to 10.4 years for men.

The women respondents were more likely to teach in accredited programs, although not in statistically significant numbers. Sixty percent of the women but only 48.1 percent of the men responding taught in accredited programs.

Women and men respondents reported that they taught virtually the same number of writing classes. The mean number of

---

[22] $X2=9.2318$, df=1, $p<.005$.
[23] $X2=5.20868$, df=2, $p=.07$.
[24] X2 with grouped data=6.45867, df=2, $p<.05$.

writing classes taught each term was 1.69 for women and 1.60 for men. Men and women required virtually the same amount of work in their magazine and feature writing classes. The mean number of stories required for women was 4.8 and for men 4.7. Similarly, they required virtually the same number of drafts: 1.7 for women respondents and 1.8 for men.

The original thrust of this study was to gauge the extent to which the process-method instruction was being used in magazine and feature writing classes. In this regard, women emerged as more likely to use the process method (N=32, 74.4 percent) compared to the men (N=25, 55.6 percent). The differences were not large enough to be statistically significant.[25]

Going beyond a simple division of instructional methods, differences do emerge with regard to how the genders behave in the classroom.

Women were more likely to report favoring a style of instruction that might be best described as "participatory." Although results were not statistically significant, women (N=37, 77.8 percent) were more likely to use the workshop method, in which the whole class comments on a story, than the men (N=33, 64.7 percent). Women (N=23, 47.9 percent) also were more likely to involve students in the coaching process--students critiquing and suggesting changes one on one--than the men responding (N=15, 30 percent) but this time in numbers that were statistically significant.[26]

---

[25] $X2=3.42887$, df=1, $p=.06$.
[26] $X2=3.053$, df=1, $p<.05$.

Respondents also indicated that women were more likely to involve themselves in each step of the student's writing process. Male instructors, in contrast, had greater contact in only a few key areas. But in each instance, differences were not large enough to be statistically significant.

In almost every stage of the writing process--from formulating the initial idea to rewriting, more women instructors required that their students turn in some sort of assignment for feedback. In only the early phases of the writing process (formulating the idea and outlining the story), did slightly more men require students to hand in an assignment for feedback (see Table 1). In only one instance--turning in source lists--were the differences large enough to be statistically significant.[27]

[27] $X2=4,65579$, $df=1$, $p<.05$.

Table 1

Student Assignments

by Gender of Instructor

	Gender of Instructor			
	Female		Male	
Assignment	N	%	N	%
Written idea	35	68.6	37	71.2
Query	39	76.5	34	65.4
Source List	37	72.5	27	51.9
Outline	20	39.2	23	44.2
First Draft	45	88.2	43	82.7
Rewrite	45	88.2	42	80.8

Not only did a greater portion of the women instructors review their students' work every step along the writing process, but they also were more likely to grade the individual steps along the way. In every step of the writing process, women instructors were more likely to assign a grade than the men (see Table 2); but, in only the source list option, were the

differences between the genders large enough to be statistically significant.[28]

Table 2

Grading Practices

by Gender of Instructor

	Gender of Instructor			
	Female		Male	
Assignments Graded	N	%	N	%
Written Idea	16	31.4	12	23.5
Query	29	56.9	23	45.1
Source List	17	33.3	8	15.7
Outline	9	17.6	8	15.7
First Draft	29	56.9	29	56.9
Rewrite	50	98.0	47	92.2

Male instructors were more likely to play the dominant role outside the classroom. According to these respondents, male instructors were likely to meet with students on their writing assignments outside the classroom as much as or more than their female counterparts (see Table 3). None of the differences, however, was statistically significant.

[28] $X2=4.29195$, $df=1$, $p<.05$.

Table 3

Meeting with Students on Writing Assignments Outside of Classroom by Gender of Instructor

	Gender of Instructor			
	Female		Male	
Meeting Topic	N	%	N	%
Idea	26	53.1	26	53.1
Query	10	20.4	10	20.4
Source List	12	24.5	10	20.4
Outline	9	18.4	17	34.7
First Draft	35	71.4	37	75.5
Rewrite	16	32.7	22	44.9

Respondents were asked to rank the top three advantages and top three disadvantages of their teaching methods. To these questions, certain respondents noted only one or two, while others noted more than five. Only the top three were coded for the purposes of this study.

On the positive side (see Table 4), women and men tended to identify the same advantages of their teaching techniques. Yet the strength of the relationship tended to depend upon the gender of the respondent. Both women and men pointed to students solving their own problems as the key advantage of their teaching techniques, although greater numbers of women were more likely to cite this as one of their top three advantages.[29] While citing it as important

[29]Differences between the two groups were not large enough to be statistically significant.

advantage, men saw it only as equal to replicating a "real world" environment in the classroom, an advantage that placed a weak second among female respondents. The advantage that placed last among the women was the "nurturing" advantage ("Students learn in a nurturing environment"). Male respondents were more likely to cite this as an advantage of their techniques than the women.

Table 4

Advantages of Teaching Techniques Cited by Gender of the Respondent

	Gender of Respondent			
	Female		Male	
Advantages	N	%	N	%
Students solve own problems	35	27.8	30	23.3
Students learn to give/take criticism	20	15.9	14	10.9
Students learn in nurturing environment	11	8.7	15	11.6
Students learn in "real-world" environment	25	19.8	30	23.3
Students receive detailed feedback	21	16.7	25	19.4
Students learn in steps of writing	15	11.9	15	11.6

On the disadvantage side, women and men respondents were likely to cite the same problems: students who depend too greatly on

the instructors, do assignments at the last minute and are afraid to take risks (see Table 5).[30] However, one disadvantage was cited more frequently by women--grade inflation. Because female instructors were more likely to require students to turn in assignments along the writing process and grade those efforts, women were more likely to face that problem. Yet, it is the male instructors who were more likely to complain that their techniques were too time consuming, even though fewer required students to turn in assignments along the writing process and fewer graded such assignments. Male complaints may have emanated from the time-consuming, out-of-class conferences with students on writing assignments.

Table 5

Disadvantages Cited

by Gender of Respondent

	Gender of Respondents			
	Female		Male	
Disadvantages	N	%	N	%
Students afraid to take risks	16	14.3	16	13.6
Students work at last minute	17	15.2	23	19.5
Students too dependent on instructor	34	30.4	39	33.1
Grade inflation	16	14.3	7	5.9
Too time consuming	15	13.4	21	17.7
Other	14	12.4	12	10.2

[30]Differences between the two groups were not large enough to be statistically significant.

Respondents were also asked why they teach as they do. In the forced choice selection, respondents could pick from journalism experience, teaching experience, research in journalism or English, seminars and speakers. Women and men selected different reasons for the way they teach at a statistically significant level.[31] Women tended to rely on teaching experience as the reason for their methods; men tended to credit professional journalism experience (see Table 6)

Table 6

Reasons for Teaching Technique

by Gender of Respondent

	Gender of Respondent			
	Female		Male	
Reasons	N	%	N	%
Journalism Experience	18	38.3	30	61.2
Teaching Experience	21	44.7	16	32.7
Research/Seminars	8	17.0	3	6.1

Discussion

In her 1988 update of women in journalism and mass communication, Schamber makes the point that women are quickly "catching up" with men in advanced academic degrees. The demographic findings in this study seem to bear out Schamber's optimism. Women respondents were more likely to hold advanced

[31] $X2=5.891$, $df=2$, $p<.05$.

academic degrees than the men, although not by margins large enough to be statistically significant. Moreover, the "gap" in teaching experience between the genders does not appear to exist. The only gap still remaining--at least according to these respondents--is in professional journalistic experience.

Nonetheless, these findings should be handled with caution. The sample group, the membership of the Magazine Division, may not be representative of all AEJMC members. These findings may be generalized only to the membership of the Magazine Division.

With regard to instructional writing load, women and men reported that they taught virtually the same number of writing classes each semester/quarter. Moreover, they also required almost the same work in magazine and feature-writing classes and even saw identical numbers of drafts. In writing classes, these respondents indicated that the writing instructional load was about evenly divided between the genders.

The focus of this study dealt with teaching method and here "closing the gap" seems especially pertinent. Contrary to anecdotes, student expectations and stereotypes, these women and men--with only a few notable exceptions--teach in similar manners.

The exceptions are worth noting first. In one of the few findings that were statistically significant, it appears that the women preferred a participatory classroom style, urging students to assume the coaching job. This participatory style would be in keeping with many of the concepts introduced in essays dealing with feminist pedagogy. Yet none of the respondents indicated that feminist pedagogical models entered into the reasons for the teaching style

adopted. In response to open-ended questions, respondents preferred to emphasize the benefits that emanated from the classroom itself. One woman from the Midwest emphasized that the participatory style of the process writing method was more effective than the "spirit crushing," more traditional approaches to instruction. Another woman instructor found that this participatory style, based on the process instructional method, gave the students a sense of ownership of their writing. "They [students] own their own work when it's process oriented." A Southern woman educator preferred the participatory nature of the process method: "The traditional method by which I was taught [was] frustrating for all."

Other findings, however, emphasized the similarities in the instructional methods, even if anecdotal evidence, student expectations and stereotypes seem to suggest otherwise. Indeed, many women respondents reported that they had adopted a structured approach in their evaluation of students. More women than men were grading steps of the writing process. Unlike anecdotal evidence and student expectations, the women were no more likely to meet with students about writing assignments outside of class than the men. This is not meant to suggest, however, that women do not meet frequently with students outside of class. As a number of studies have suggested, women often meet with students outside of class on topics unrelated to materials covered in courses.[32]

The advantages cited for these teaching methods, likewise, seem to run counter to commonly held assertions about women educators. There is much the genders have in common in viewing

---

[32]Sharp et al., op. cit., p. 35.

the advantages of their teaching methods. Both seek to have students solve their own problems and learn in a "real-world" environment. Only a minority of the women responding saw a "nurturing" environment as an advantage of their teaching style. More men than women credited "nurturing" as an advantage. This seems to contradict some of the basic tenets that students hold with regard to female teachers and comments made by women in journalism education themselves.

Why the variation? This is perhaps the most difficult question to answer. With only a few exceptions, there is little in this study to suggest that women and men teach in different manners. Contrary to maternal, nurturing stereotypes, the women in this study seem to employ a detached, structured approach in their dealings with students. While the women emphasize that they are more likely to incorporate a "participatory" approach in the classroom, actively involving students in the coaching process, they did not label this as "nurturing." Indeed, the women respondents specifically avoided that term.

Perhaps the most important finding of this study is that stereotypes, anecdotes and student expectations may be far removed from the reality of how women actually teach. In the end, these women seem to be balancing two seemingly contradictory styles. One is a participatory approach in the classroom that encourages student participation via the coaching process (which would be in line with both the feminist and composition pedagogy). The second is a structured approach to feedback that calls for extensive grading

and downplays the out-of-class personal interaction with students, which the participatory approach seems to invite.

Certainly, this study suggested that women and men in the writing classroom have more in common than expected. More studies, however, are needed to look more fully at the genders in the classroom.